REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

With this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1 and 121 and adds new claims 124 and 125. No new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1, 4, 9-18 and 121-125 are all the claims currently pending in the present application. Based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the claims.

I.   Rejection of Claims 1, 4, 9-18 & 121-123 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4, 9-18 and 121-123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hertzog et al. (U.S. Patent Appln. Publn. No. 2003/0069874; hereinafter "Hertzog") in view of Rensin et al. (U.S. Patent Appln. Publn. No. 2002/0152332; hereinafter "Rensin").

Claim 1, as herein amended recites, *inter alia*, an apparatus comprising memory storage areas, connected to one or more processors configured for: mapping *a plurality of fields of contact data* from personal information manager (PIM) software *to a plurality of corresponding fields* of *a web page* of a web application to produce mapping data; causing display of the web page of the web application, wherein the causing display includes causing *display* of *a prompt requesting input of data* into *the plurality of corresponding fields* of *the web page* of the web application.

Applicant submits that the combination of Hertzog and Rensin does not teach or suggest all of the above features of claim 1. In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner correctly concedes that Hertzog does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. However, the Examiner relies on Rensin to make up for the deficiencies of Hertzog. (See pgs. 4-5 of the Office Action) Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that Rensin does not make up for what Hertzog lacks.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner relies on the "category_fields table 94 ... defined in ... fields table 100" of Hertzog as corresponding to the claimed corresponding fields of the web page of the web application, as required by claim 1. (See pg. 3 of the Office Action) Hertzog, alone or in combination with Rensin, at most discloses that the category_fields table 94 includes

a "user_id" field, a "cat_id" field, a "field_id" field, an "ind" field, a "deleted_flag" field and a "sequence_id" field. (See FIG. 6 of Hertzog) Additionally, in rejecting claim 1, the Examiner relies on paragraphs [0109], [0110] and [0134] of Hertzog, alone or in combination with Rensin, as allegedly disclosing "causing display of the web page of the web application wherein the causing display includes causing display of a prompt requesting input for the one or more corresponding fields of the web page of the web application". (See pg. 3 of the Office Action) Additionally, the Examiner relies on the persistent window 182 of Hertzog as corresponding to the claimed web page of the web application. (See pgs. 3-4 of the Office Action)

In contrast to claim 1, the cited portion and indeed all of Hertzog, alone or in combination with Rensin, at most, discloses that the persistent window 182 may be accessible via a graphical user interface to provide convenient access to a power find panel 134 without requiring opening of a main window 130. The cited portion also describes that the persistent window 182 has a text input field 184 into which a user may input text and also explains that the persistent window 182 includes a contact tab, a web tab, and a stock tab in order to allow a user to direct a search. (See paragraph [0134] & FIG. 10A of Hertzog)

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, causing display of the web page of the web application, wherein the causing display includes causing *display* of *a prompt requesting input of data* into *the plurality of corresponding fields* of *the web page* of the web application that were mapped to a plurality of fields of contact data from personal information manager (PIM) software. In contrast to claim 1, nowhere in Hertzog, alone or in combination with Rensin, is there any mention, teaching or suggestion relating to causing display of the persistent window 182 (alleged web page of the web application) including display of *a prompt* requesting input of data into the category_fields table 94 (alleged corresponding fields) of the persistent window 182 (alleged web page of the web application), as would be required by the recitations of claim 1. Rather, Hertzog, alone or in combination with Rensin at best discloses that text may be input into a single text field 184. However, Hertzog, alone or in combination with Rensin, does not contemplate that the persistent window 182 (alleged web page of the web application) includes display of a prompt requesting input of data into the category_fields table 94 (alleged corresponding fields of the web page) that were mapped to a plurality of fields of contact data

from PIM software, as would be required by the recitations of claim 1. The elements of the combination of Hertzog and Rensin are simply not arranged as required by claim 1. As such, the combination is deficient and does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1.

The features recited in independent claim 1, allow for a user to automatically populate fields of a web page with contact data after being requested to enter input for the fields–by mapping contact data in the plurality of corresponding fields of the web page. An exemplary embodiment relating to these features is described below in order to aid in the understanding of these features.

As described in at least paragraph [0023] of the originally-filed specification, a computing device *displays a web page having fields prompting the user to enter*, for example, a name, address, city, state, zip code, and country into *the corresponding fields* of the web page. (See e.g., FIG. 5A) In this exemplary embodiment, if the user enters the letters "Jo" into the main field of the web page, the computing device executes the interface software using the mapping data 118 that is mapped to the fields of the web page to retrieve contact data that has the same two letters "Jo" in the last name field of the contact data. (See e.g., FIGS. 5B & 5C) The computing device then retrieves the matching sets of contact data and displays them on the monitor. In this example, the user can select the desired contact information, such as "James Joplin's" contact information. In response, *the fields of the web page are automatically populated with the selected person's contact data* (e.g., automatically populated with James Joplin's information), which can then be transmitted via a network.

This functionality allows the user to browse contact data of various people and select one person's contact information to automatically populate the fields of a web page. Neither Hertzog nor Rensin, whether considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features recited in independent claim 1.

Based on at least the foregoing reasons, the combination of Hertzog and Rensin is deficient and does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 4 and 9-18.

Since independent claim 121 contains features analogous to, though not necessarily coextensive with, the features recited in independent claim 1, Applicant submits that independent claim 121 and its dependent claims 122 and 123 are patentable at least for reasons analogous to those submitted above for independent claim 1.

II.   New Claims

Applicant herein adds new claims 124 and 125 to provide more varied protection of Applicant's invention as described in the specification. In addition to their respective dependencies from claims 1 and 121, Applicant submits that claims 124 and 125 are independently patentable given that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of these claims.

III.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued in due course. Examiner Zhen is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

Cory C. Davis
Registration No. 59,932

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000
Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON April 8, 2009.